

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-27 were originally filed in this patent application. In response to a first office action dated 04/19/2006, an amendment was filed on 07/19/2006 that cancelled claims 16-17, 21-22 and 24-25 and amended claims 15, 20 and 23. In response to a second office action dated 10/04/2006, a Request for Reconsideration was filed on 01/04/2007. In response to a third office action dated 05/17/2007, an amendment was filed on 8/17/2007 that cancelled claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 23, and 26-27 and amended claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 20. In the pending final office action, claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,675 to Graves *et al.* (hereinafter “Graves”). No claim was allowed. In this amendment, claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 19-20 are currently pending.

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Graves. Each of these claims is addressed below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite:

. . . the database query processor processing a first query to a database to generate a first result set by interrogating the database, and *after interrogating the database has begun* while processing the first query, evaluates at least one other query that is received during the processing of the first query . . .

Graves teaches delaying processing a plurality of received queries, as stated by the examiner. Graves does not teach or suggest evaluating other queries after interrogating the database has

begun while processing a first query as expressly recited in claim 1. As a result, claim 1 is allowable over Graves.

Claims 4, 8, 11, 15 and 20

Claims 4, 8, 11, 15 and 20 include limitations similar to those in claim 1 discussed above, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 3

Claim 3 depends on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 3 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim 10

Claim 10 depends on claim 8, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 10 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim 19

Claim 19 depends on claim 15 which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 19 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Conclusion

In summary, Graves does not teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /derekpmartin/
Derek P. Martin
Reg. No. 36,595

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700